

### REMARKS

In reply to the restriction requirement dated June 8, 2006, the applicants elect claims 26-32 and withdraw claims 18-25 and 33-48. This election is made without traverse or prejudice.

Applicants wish to clarify the characterization of each embodiment as "comprising at least" (for Embodiments 1-3) or "comprising" (for Embodiment 4). Specifically, using Embodiment 2 as an example (the elected claims), the applicant interprets that statement to mean that at least one of claims 26-32 includes "a plurality of substantially orthogonal bushings" (claim 28). This limitation therefore is not necessarily in the other claims. In other words, only claim 28 has the limitation explicitly recited in the office action and thus, claims 26-27 and 29-32 are not limited in this manner. The other claims also are not limited as recited for similar reasons.

The applicants also wish to point out that the examiner appears to have made a typographical error by stating that Embodiment 2 "comprises . . . bushings. . . not recited in any of claims 26-48." To the contrary, "a plurality of substantially orthogonal bushings" is recited, as discussed above, in claim 28.

Finally, applicants agree that Embodiment 3 does not require an "encapsulating material," but they do not agree with the statement that both Embodiments 2 and 4 require the encapsulating material.

Applicants request that the examiner contact applicant's attorney, Steven Saunders (617-443-9292), if it will facilitate prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven G. Saunders  
Registration No. 36,265